Project Title	Special Development Permit to construct a new 22,590 square-foot shopping center and Re-Zone from M-S (Industrial & Service) to M-S/PD (Industrial & Service/Planned Development) Zoning District
Lead Agency Name and Address	City of Sunnyvale PO Box 3707 Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707
Contact Person	Jamie McLeod
Phone Number	408-730-7429
Project Location	595 Lawrence Expressway
Project Sponsor's Name	Jeffrey A. Morris
Address	2500 Sand Hill Rd. #240, Menlo Park, CA 94025
Zoning	MS
General Plan	Industrial
Other Public Agencies whose approval is required	County Roads and Airports Division (for work impacting Lawrence Expressway)

**Description of the Project:** The application includes a Special Development Permit and Rezoning the site from M-S (Industrial & Service) to M-S/PD (Industrial & Service/Planned Development) Zoning District. The applicant proposes demolition of the existing industrial building and construction of three commercial buildings totaling 22,590 square feet. The commercial center is intended for a variety of uses, including commercial retail, restaurant, financial institutions, and related uses.

**Surrounding Uses and Setting:** The property is bordered as follows:

East: Across Lawrence Expressway, shopping center;

Northeast: Across Lawrence Expressway, residential (Avalon at Silicon Valley);

North: Across East Duane Ave, General Industrial and auto service (car wash);

West: Across San Xavier Drive, General Industrial (AMD); and

South: Hotel (Residence Inn).

Surrounding uses are a mix of industrial, commercial and residential/hotel. The project site is at a major intersection of a county highway and commercial collector streets.

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

- 1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 3. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 4. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 5. "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 6. Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
- 7. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
- 8. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- 9. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project
- 10. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

# **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

at least one impact that is a "F following pages.	Potentia	ally Significant Impact" as in	ndicated	I by the checklist o	n the
☐ Aesthetics		Hazards & Hazardous		Public Services	
☐ Agricultural Resources		Materials Hydrology/Water		Recreation	
☐ Air Quality		Quality Land Use/Planning		Transportation/T	raffic
☐ Biological Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems	
☐ Cultural Resources		Noise		Mandatory Findi Significance	ngs of
☐ Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		Significance	
DETERMINATION: (To be come On the basis of this initial evaluated of the proposed project MAY of the basis of the proposed project MAY of the basis of the proposed project of the project of the proposed project of the project of the proposed project of th	ect could se revision GATIVE nave a si T is requ nave a "p , but at lead I standa ribed on	have a significant effect on the end have a significant effect on the end ons in the project have been made DECLARATION will be prepare gnificant effect on the environmental significant impact" or "potential significant impact" or "potential significant impact" or "potential significant impact" and east one effect (1) has been addressed attached sheets. An ENVIRONI	environme le by or a d. ent, and a otentially s quately ar by mitiga	ent, there will not be greed to by the  significant unless halyzed in an earlier tion measures	
I find that although the proposed proje potentially significant effects (a) have pursuant to applicable standards and NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including proposed project, nothing further is re	ect could been an (b) have g revision	have a significant effect on the a alyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGA be been avoided or mitigated pursi	ATIVE DE uant to the	CLARATION at earlier EIR or	
				January 27, 2006	
Signature				Date	
Jamie McLeod Printed Name				City of Sunnyvale For (Lead Agency)	
			'	(==== / igo//oj/	

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
1.	ΑE	STHETICS. Would the project:					
	a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?					2, 94
	b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?					2, 94
	C.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					2, 94, 101
	d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?					See Disc.
2.	sigi app poli ma	R QUALITY: Where available, the nificance criteria established by the blicable air quality management or air lution control district may be relied upon to ke the following determinations. Would the ject:					
	a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?					3, 94, 100, 111
	b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.					3, 94, 100, 111
	C.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?					3, 96, 97, 100, 111
	d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?					62. 63. 111. 112
	e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?					111. 112
3.	BIC	DLOGICAL RESOURCES:					
	a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					2, 94, 111, 112, 109

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
	b.	Have a substantially adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S Wildlife Service?					2, 94, 111, 112, 109
	C.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?					2, 94, 111, 112, 109
	d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?					2, 94, 111, 112, 109
	e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?					See disc.
	f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?					41,94, 111, 112
4.	CU	LTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
	a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?					10, 42, 60, 61, 94, 111
	b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5					10, 42, 94
	C.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?					10, 42, 94, 111
	d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?					2, 111, 112
5.		ND USE AND PLANNING. Would the iject:					
	a.	Physically divide an established community?					2, 11, 12, 21, 28

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
	b.	Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?					See disc.
	C.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?					2, 41, 94, 111
6.	MII	NERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
	a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?					2, 94
	b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?					2, 94
7.	NC	DISE. Would the project result in:					
	a.	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?					2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112
	b.	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?					2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112
	C.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112
	d.	A substantially temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$		See Disc.
8.		PULATION AND HOUSING. Would the pject:					
	a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?					2, 94

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
<ul> <li>Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</li> </ul>					2, 11, 111, 112
Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					2, 11, 111, 112
9. <b>PUBLIC SERVICES</b> . Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
a. Schools?					2, 111, 112
b. Police protection?					26, 65, 66, 103, 104
c. Fire protection?					26, 65, 66, 103, 104
d. Parks?					2, 111, 112
e. Other services?					26, 65, 66, 103, 104
10. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE					
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?					2, 10, 26, 42, 59, 60, 61, 111, 112

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?					1, 2, 111, 112
C.	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?					111, 112
11. GE	EOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:					
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:					See Disc.
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.					UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?					"
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?					u
	iv) Landslides?					"
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?					íí.
C.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?					í c

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-a-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?					"
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?					"
	TILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would project:					
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?					2, 20, 24, 87, 88, 89, 90, 111, 112
b.	Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					2, 20, 24, 25, 87, 88, 89, 111, 112
C.	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					2, 20, 24, 25, 87, 88, 89, 111, 112
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?					2, 20, 24, 25, 87, 88, 89, 111, 112
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?					2, 20, 24, 25, 87, 88, 89, 111, 112
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?					2, 22, 90, 111, 112
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?					2, 22, 90, 111, 112

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
	ANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the pject:					
a.	Cause an increase in the traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?					See Disc.
b.	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?					2, 12, 71, 75-77, 80, 84, 111, 112
C.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?					2, 111, 112, 113
d.	Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?					2, 12, 71, 75-77, 80, 84, 111, 112
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?					2, 111, 112, 113
f.	Result in inadequate parking capacity?					See Disc.
g.	Conflict with adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				$\boxtimes$	2, 12, 81, 111, 112
	ZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. ould the project?					
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?				$\boxtimes$	UFC, UBC, SVMC
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?					UFC, UBC, SVMC
C.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an exiting or proposed school?				$\boxtimes$	UFC, UBC, SVMC

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?					UFC, UBC, SVMC
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					UFC, UBC, SVMC
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					UFC, UBC, SVMC
g.	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?					UFC, UBC, SVMC
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands					UFC, UBC, SVMC
15. RE	CREATION					
a.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					2, 18, 111, 112
b.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?					2, 18, 111, 112
who sign ma Eva pre Con ass	eRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining ether impacts to agricultural resources are nificant environmental effects, lead agencies by refer to the California Agricultural Land aduation and Site Assessment Model (1997) expared by the California Department of anservation as an optional model to use in sessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.					

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
6	or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to nonagricultural use?					94
k	c. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?					94
C	<ul> <li>Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use</li> </ul>					94
	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would ne project:					
a	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?					2, 24, 25, 111, 112
t	Substantially degrade groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?					2, 24, 25, 111, 112
C	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation onor off-site?					2, 24, 25, 111, 112
C	I. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?					2, 24, 25, 111, 112
•	e. Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?					See Disc.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?					2, 24, 25, 111, 112
g.	Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?					2, 24, 25, 111, 112
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?					2, 24, 25, 111, 112
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?					2, 24, 25, 111, 112
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?					2, 24, 25, 111, 112

# Discussion:

- **1.d. AESTHETICS:** The proposed commercial center will result in additional sources of light in the evening to light the center; while considered appropriate for this site, it will result in an increase from the current level of evening lighting. The City Code requires new developments to not cast light on neighboring properties.
- **3.e. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** The applicant has proposed removing existing mature trees; however, installation of replacement trees can be addressed through the landscape plans. Staff recommends maintaining the tree barrier along the southern boundary of the site to maintain a buffer with the neighboring hotel use.
- **7.d. NOISE:** The proposed project is expected to result in additional noise levels on evening and weekends above the current level. However, these levels are expected to be within the designated levels for this area. Further, excessive noise would be controlled by the City's Noise Ordinance.
- **11.a. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:** Given that Sunnyvale is located in an earthquake-prone area, the negative responses to this question are based on not increasing the existing relative risk.
- **13.a. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC:** The proposed use would increase traffic over the existing levels, increasing the Peak Hour Trips from 24 to 42. However, the location of

the proposed retail center along a major roadway (Lawrence Expressway) which minimizes the expected impact on the surrounding areas. Further, the City will collect the standard Transportation Impact Fee as part of the application process to use for traffic mitigating programs or projects.

**13.f. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC:** The Special Development Permit shall include discussion of and proposed limitations on allowable uses or hours of operation on the site to address potential parking deficiencies.

**17.e. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** The proposed development will result in additional hardscape on the site. However, potential impacts to stormwater runoff shall be addressed through the required StormWater Management Plan (SWMP) to be in compliance with the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program.

Jamie McLeod 01 / 27 / 2006

Completed By Date

# City of Sunnyvale General Plan:

- Map
- 3. Air Quality Sub-Element
- 4. Community Design Sub-Element
- 5. Community Participation Sub-Element
- 6. Cultural Arts Sub-Element
- 7. Executive Summary
- 8. Fire Services Sub-Element
- 9. Fiscal Sub-Element
- 10. Heritage Preservation Sub-Element
- 11. Housing & Community Revitalization Sub-Element
- 12. Land Use & Transportation Sub-Element
- 13. Law Enforcement Sub-Element
- 14. Legislative Management Sub-Element
- 15. Library Sub-Element
- 16. Noise Sub-Element
- 17. Open Space Sub-Element.
- 18. Recreation Sub-Element
- 19. Safety & Seismic Safety Sub-Element
- 20. Sanitary Sewer System Sub-Element
- 21. Socio-Economic Sub-Element
- 22. Solid Waste Management Sub-Element
- 23. Support Services Sub-Element
- 24. Surface Run-off Sub-Element
- 25. Water Resources Sub-Element

## 26. City of Sunnyvale Municipal Code:

- 27. Chapter 10
- 28. Zoning Map
- 29. Chapter 19.42. Operating Standards
- 30. Chapter 19.28. Downtown Specific Plan District
- 31. Chapter 19.18. Residential Zoning Districts
- 32. Chapter 19.20. Commercial Zoning Districts
- 33. Chapter 19.22. Industrial Zoning Districts
- 34. Chapter 19.24. Office Zoning Districts
- 35. Chapter 19.26. Combining Zoning Districts
- 36. Chapter 19.28. Downtown Specific Plan
- 37. Chapter 19.46. Off-Street Parking & Loading
- 38. Chapter 19.56. Solar Access
- 39. Chapter 19.66. Affordable Housing
- 40. Chapter 19.72. Conversion of Mobile Home Parks to Other Uses
- 41. Chapter 19.94. Tree Preservation
- 42. Chapter 19.96. Heritage Preservation

### **Specific Plans**

- 43. El Camino Real Precise Plan
- 44. Lockheed Site Master Use Permit
- 45. Moffett Field Comprehensive Use Plan
- 46. 101 & Lawrence Site Specific Plan
- 47. Southern Pacific Corridor Plan

# **Environmental Impact Reports**

- 48. Futures Study Environmental Impact Report
- 49. Lockheed Site Master Use Permit Environmental Impact Report
- 50. Tasman Corridor LRT Environmental Impact Study (supplemental)
- 51. Kaiser Permanente Medical Center Replacement

- Center Environmental Impact Report (City of Santa Clara)
- 52. Downtown Development Program Environmental Impact Report
- 53. Caribbean-Moffett Park Environmental Impact Report
- 54. Southern Pacific Corridor Plan Environmental Impact Report

# Maps

- 55. City of Sunnyvale Aerial Maps
- 56. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FEMA)
- 57. Santa Clara County Assessors Parcel
- 58. Utility Maps (50 scale)

#### Lists/Inventories

- 59. Sunnyvale Cultural Resources Inventory List
- 60. Heritage Landmark Designation List
- 61. Santa Clara County Heritage Resource Inventory
- 62. Hazardous Waste & Substances Sites List (State of California)
- 63. List of Known Contaminants in Sunnyvale

### Legislation/Acts/Bills/Codes

- 64. Subdivision Map Act
- 65. Uniform Fire Code, including amendments per SMC adoption
- 66. National Fire Code (National Fire Protection Association)
- 67. Title 19 California Administrative Code
- 68. California Assembly Bill 2185/2187 (Waters Bill)
- 69. California Assembly Bill 3777 (La Follette Bill)
- 70. Superfund Amendments & Reauthorization Act (SARA) Title III

# **Transportation**

- 71. California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual
- 72. California Department of Transportation Traffic Manual
- 73. California Department of Transportation Standard
  Plan
- 74. California Department of Transportation Standard Specification
- 75. Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation
- 76. Institute of Transportation Engineers
  Transportation and Traffic Engineering
  Handbook
- 77. U.S. Dept. of Transportation Federal Highway Admin. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Street and Highways
- 78. California Vehicle Code
- 79. Traffic Engineering Theory & Practice by L. J. Pegnataro
- 80. Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program and Technical Guidelines
- 81. Santa Clara County Transportation Agency Short Range Transit Plan

### Environmental Checklist Form

Project Number: 2005-1048
Project Address: 595 Lawrence Expressway
Applicant: Jeffrey A. Morris

- 82. Santa Clara County Transportation Plan
- 83. Traffic Volume Studies, City of Sunnyvale Public works Department of Traffic Engineering Division
- 84. Santa Clara County Sub-Regional Deficiency Plan
- 85. Bicycle Plan

### **Public Works**

- 86. Standard Specifications and Details of the Department of Public Works
- 87. Storm Drain Master Plan
- 88. Sanitary Sewer Master Plan
- 89. Water Master Plan
- 90. Solid Waste Management Plan of Santa Clara County
- 91. Geotechnical Investigation Reports
- 92. Engineering Division Project Files
- 93. Subdivision and Parcel Map Files

# Miscellaneous

- 94. Field Inspection
- 95. Environmental Information Form
- 96. Annual Summary of Containment Excesses (BAAQMD)
- 97. Current Air Quality Data
- 98. Chemical Emergency Preparedness Program (EPA) Interim Document in 1985?)

- 99. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Population Projections
- 100. Bay Area Clean Air Plan
- 101. City-wide Design Guidelines
- 102. Industrial Design Guidelines

# **Building Safety**

- Uniform Building Code, Volume 1, (Including the California Building Code, Volume 1)
- 104. Uniform Building Code, Volume 2, (Including the California Building Code, Volume 2)
- 105. Uniform Plumbing Code, (Including the California Plumbing Code)
- Uniform Mechanical Code, (Including the California Mechanical Code)
- National Electrical Code (Including California Electrical Code)
- 108. Title 16 of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code

### **Additional References**

- 109. USFWS/CA Dept. F&G Special Status Lists
- 110. Project Traffic Impact Analysis
- 111. Project Description
- 112. Project Development Plans
- 113. Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Plan
- 114. Federal Aviation Administration